

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Digital Repository

Ames Laboratory Accepted Manuscripts

Ames Laboratory

4-11-2019

Pressure-temperature phase diagram of the EuRbFe₄As₄ superconductor

Li Xiang

Iowa State University and Ames Laboratory, ives@iastate.edu

Sergey L. Bud'ko

Iowa State University and Ames Laboratory, budko@ameslab.gov

Jin-Ke Bao

Argonne National Laboratory

Duck Young Chung

Argonne National Laboratory

Mercouri G. Kanatzidis

Argonne National Laboratory

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/ameslab_manuscripts

 Part of the [Condensed Matter Physics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Xiang, Li; Bud'ko, Sergey L.; Bao, Jin-Ke; Chung, Duck Young; Kanatzidis, Mercouri G.; and Canfield, Paul C., "Pressure-temperature phase diagram of the EuRbFe₄As₄ superconductor" (2019). *Ames Laboratory Accepted Manuscripts*. 299.
https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/ameslab_manuscripts/299

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ames Laboratory at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ames Laboratory Accepted Manuscripts by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Pressure-temperature phase diagram of the $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ superconductor

Abstract

The pressure dependencies of the magnetic and superconducting transitions, as well as that of the superconducting upper critical field, are reported for single crystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$. Resistance measurements were performed under hydrostatic pressures up to 6.21 GPa and in magnetic fields up to 9 T. Zero-field-cooled magnetization measurements were performed under hydrostatic pressures up to 1.24 GPa under 20 mT applied field. Superconducting transition temperature, T_c , up to 6.21 GPa and magnetic transition temperature, T_M , up to 1.24 GPa were obtained and a pressure-temperature phase diagram was constructed. Our results show that T_c is monotonically suppressed upon increasing pressure. T_M is linearly increased up to 1.24 GPa. For the studied pressure range, no signs of the crossing of T_M and T_c lines are observed. The normalized slope of the superconducting upper critical field is gradually suppressed with increasing pressure, which may be due to the continuous change of Fermi velocity v_F with pressure.

Disciplines

Condensed Matter Physics

Authors

Li Xiang, Sergey L. Bud'ko, Jin-Ke Bao, Duck Young Chung, Mercouri G. Kanatzidis, and Paul C. Canfield

Pressure-temperature phase diagram of the $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ superconductor

Li Xiang,^{1,2,*} Sergey L. Bud'ko,^{1,2} Jin-Ke Bao,³ Duck Young Chung,³ Mercouri G. Kanatzidis,³ and Paul C. Canfield^{1,2,†}

¹*Ames Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011, USA*

³*Materials Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439, USA*



(Received 22 February 2019; published 11 April 2019)

The pressure dependencies of the magnetic and superconducting transitions, as well as that of the superconducting upper critical field, are reported for single crystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$. Resistance measurements were performed under hydrostatic pressures up to 6.21 GPa and in magnetic fields up to 9 T. Zero-field-cooled magnetization measurements were performed under hydrostatic pressures up to 1.24 GPa under 20 mT applied field. Superconducting transition temperature, T_c , up to 6.21 GPa and magnetic transition temperature, T_M , up to 1.24 GPa were obtained and a pressure-temperature phase diagram was constructed. Our results show that T_c is monotonically suppressed upon increasing pressure. T_M is linearly increased up to 1.24 GPa. For the studied pressure range, no signs of the crossing of T_M and T_c lines are observed. The normalized slope of the superconducting upper critical field is gradually suppressed with increasing pressure, which may be due to the continuous change of Fermi velocity v_F with pressure.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevB.99.144509](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevB.99.144509)

I. INTRODUCTION

New members of the Fe-based superconductors (FeSC) family, $AeA\text{Fe}_4\text{As}_4$ ($Ae = \text{Ca, Sr}$; $A = \text{K, Rb, Cs}$), the so-called 1144 compounds, were discovered by Iyo *et al.* in 2016 [1]. Different from a homogeneous, random substitution, as in $(Ae_{0.5}A_{0.5})\text{Fe}_2\text{As}_2$ where Ae/A share the same crystallographic site and retain the parent-compound symmetry $I4/mmm$, these new members crystallize into structural type $P4/mmm$ where Ae and A have their own unique crystallographic sites and form alternating layers along the c axis [1,2]. Since discovery, the 1144 compounds have received significant attention because these stoichiometric compounds offer new, clean platforms for the study of, among other things, the relation between superconductivity and possible long-range magnetic order in the FeSC. Moreover, a new type of magnetic order, spin-vortex-crystal order, has been realized in Co- and Ni-substituted $\text{CaKFe}_4\text{As}_4$, which was argued to be strongly related to its structure [3].

Among the new 1144 compounds, the $\text{Eu(Rb, Cs)Fe}_4\text{As}_4$ compounds have been studied intensively due to the possible coexistence of superconductivity and ferromagnetism [2,4–8]. Polycrystalline $\text{Eu(Rb, Cs)Fe}_4\text{As}_4$ compounds were first discovered in 2016 and were shown to be superconductors with $T_c \sim 35$ K and a magnetic transition temperature $T_M \sim 15$ K [2]. Different from the undoped EuFe_2As_2 where Eu^{2+} orders antiferromagnetically [9–11], the magnetic transition in $\text{RbEuFe}_4\text{As}_4$ is suggested to be ferromagnetic, which is associated with the ordering of the Eu^{2+} moments perpendicular to the crystallographic c axis [4,8]. Though the exact magnetic structure of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ has not been established

so far, the possible coexistence of superconductivity and ferromagnetism makes $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ one of the systems where the relation between these states may be studied [12–24].

Two substitution studies on polycrystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ have been published. On one hand, Ni substitution on the Fe site suppresses T_c whereas T_M is almost unchanged [25]. On the other hand, substitution of nonmagnetic Ca on the Eu site suppresses T_M while T_c is almost unchanged [26]. Both of these results suggest that superconductivity and ferromagnetism are almost independent of each other in this system. An optical investigation on single crystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ suggests weak interaction between superconductivity and ferromagnetism and that superconductivity is affected by the in-plane ferromagnetism mainly at domain boundaries [7].

Pressure, as another commonly used tuning parameter, is considered less perturbing than substitution because it does not introduce chemical disorder into the system. A high pressure study up to ~ 30 GPa on polycrystalline $\text{Eu(Rb, Cs)Fe}_4\text{As}_4$ shows that for both compositions, upon increasing pressure, T_c is suppressed while T_M is enhanced, and they cross near 7 GPa [27]. In addition, a half-collapsed-tetragonal (hcT) phase transition, similar to the one observed in the $\text{CaKFe}_4\text{As}_4$ series [28,29], is suggested to take place at ~ 10 GPa for $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ and ~ 12 GPa for $\text{EuCsFe}_4\text{As}_4$ [27], which is roughly consistent with theoretical calculations [30]. In this high-pressure study, signatures of transitions are broad, and zero resistance was never achieved below T_c due, most likely, to the use of polycrystalline samples.

In this work, we present a pressure study on single crystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ up to 6.21 GPa. From resistance measurements up to 6.21 GPa and magnetization measurements up to 1.24 GPa, T_c and T_M are tracked and presented in a pressure-temperature (p - T) phase diagram. Our results show that T_c

*ives@iastate.edu

†canfield@ameslab.gov




FIG. 1. (a),(b) Evolution of the in-plane resistance with hydrostatic pressures up to 6.21 GPa measured in a mBAC for EuRbFe₄As₄ sample 1 and sample 2, respectively. (c),(d) Blowups of the low temperature region showing the superconducting transition. The criterion for T_c^{offset} is indicated by an arrow in (c).

is monotonically suppressed and T_M is linearly increased. Further superconducting upper critical field analysis indicates no qualitative change of Fermi surface within the studied pressure range.

II. EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS

High-quality single crystals of EuRbFe₄As₄ with sharp superconducting transitions at ambient pressure [see Figs. 1(c) and 1(d) and Fig. 5(b) below] were grown as described in Ref. [5]. The *ab* in-plane ac resistance measurements under pressure for two samples, 1 and 2, were performed in a Quantum Design Physical Property Measurement System (PPMS) using a 1 mA excitation with frequency of 17 Hz, on a cooling rate of 0.25 K/min. A standard, linear four-contact configuration was used. Contacts were made by soldering 25 μm Pt wires to the samples using a Sn:Pb 60:40 alloy. The magnetic field was applied along the *c* axis. A modified Bridgman anvil cell (mBAC) [31] was used to apply pressure up to 6.21 GPa. Pressure values at low temperature were inferred from the $T_c(p)$ of lead [32]. Hydrostatic conditions were achieved by using a 1:1 mixture of isopentane:*n*-pentane as the pressure medium for the mBAC, which solidifies at ~ 6.5 GPa at room temperature [33].

Low-field (20 mT) dc magnetization measurements under pressure were performed on several pieces of single crystals (referred together as sample 3) in a Quantum Design Magnetic Property Measurement System (MPMS-3) superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) magnetometer. A commercially available HMD Be-Cu piston-cylinder pressure cell [34] was used to apply pressures up to 1.24 GPa. Daphne oil 7373 was used as a pressure medium, which solidifies at 2.2 GPa at room temperature [35], ensuring hydrostatic conditions. Superconducting Sn was used as a low-temperature pressure gauge [36].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Figures 1(a) and 1(b) present the pressure dependence of the temperature dependent resistance for EuRbFe₄As₄. Two samples, sample 1 and sample 2, were measured in the mBAC for pressures up to 4.69 or 6.21 GPa. For both samples, resistance decreases upon increasing pressure. At ambient pressure for $T \sim 35$ K, a superconducting transition was observed and zero resistance was achieved for both samples. Below T_c , no features associated with the magnetic transition T_M are observed in the $R(T)$ curves down to 1.8 K. Figures 1(c) and 1(d) show blowups of the low-temperature resistance. For both samples, the superconducting transition at ambient pressure is very sharp, demonstrating good homogeneity of the single crystals. As shown in the figures, upon increasing pressure, T_c monotonically decreases in the studied pressure range. A gradually broadening of the superconducting transition was also observed in both samples. Similar behavior has been observed in many other superconductors measured in the mBAC cell and is likely due to the pressure inhomogeneity when high loads are applied.

To better visualize the pressure evolution of resistance, we present in Fig. 2 the pressure dependent resistance $R(p)$ at fixed temperatures. As shown in the figure, different from the CaKFe₄As₄ series [28,29], resistance of EuRbFe₄As₄ at various temperatures shows a smooth decrease as a function of pressure without any obvious anomalies. This implies the absence of structural transition up to 6.21 GPa, which is consistent with the results in Ref. [27] and predictions in Ref. [30] where the hcT phase transition is suggested to take place at ~ 10 GPa. The total suppression of resistance at 40 K under pressure, $\sim 55\%$ up to 4 GPa and $\sim 65\%$ up to 6.21 GPa,




FIG. 2. Pressure dependence of resistance $R(p)$ at fixed temperatures for EuRbFe₄As₄ sample 1 (a) and sample 2 (b).




FIG. 3. Temperature dependence of resistance under magnetic field up to 9 T for selective pressures for sample 2. Criteria for T_c^{offset} under magnetic fields are indicated by arrows. Current was applied in-plane and magnetic field was applied along the c axis.

is rather large compared with the $\text{CaKFe}_4\text{As}_4$ series, where the suppression at 40 K is 30%–40% up to 4 GPa, i.e., before hcT happens [28,29]. Another indication that a potential hcT phase transition has not been reached is the fact that the superconducting transitions shown in Figs. 1 and 3 are not significantly broadened and the upper critical fields, H_{c2} , remain high over our pressure range. Both $\text{CaKFe}_4\text{As}_4$ series [28,29] as well as Co-substituted CaFe_2As_2 [37,38] show loss of bulk superconductivity at the collapsed-tetragonal or lowest hcT transitions.

Temperature dependent resistance under magnetic fields up to 9 T applied along the c axis was studied and the results are presented in Fig. 3 for selected pressures for sample 2. As shown in the figure, below T_c , no features associated with the magnetic transition T_M are observed and zero resistance persists down to 1.8 K with fields up to 9 T under all pressures. For temperatures above the superconducting transition, a decrease of resistance under applied magnetic field is observed. The upper superconducting critical field, H_{c2} , can be obtained from Fig. 3 using the offset criteria defined in Figs. 1–3. The temperature dependence of H_{c2} at various pressures for sample 1 and sample 2 is presented in Fig. 4. For both samples, H_{c2} is systematically suppressed by increasing pressure. H_{c2} is linear in temperature except, for magnetic fields below 2 T, the bending of $H_{c2}(T)$ curves is more obvious at higher pressures. The curvature at low fields has been observed in other FeSC [29,39–42] and can be explained by the multiband nature of superconductivity [43], which is likely the case in $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ [7].

To study the evolution of the magnetic transition with pressure, we present, in Fig. 5, the dependence of the zero-field-cooled magnetization $M(T)$ data. During the




FIG. 4. Temperature dependence of the upper superconducting critical field, $H_{c2}(T)$, under selected pressures for (a) sample 1 and (b) sample 2.

measurements, pressure was increased up to 1.24 GPa under 20 mT applied magnetic field. As shown in Figs. 5(a) and 5(b), the superconducting transition of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ is determined from the onset of diamagnetism at $T \sim 35$ K. Whereas T_c monotonically decreases with pressure [Fig. 6(a)], there is a highly nonmonotonic change in the diamagnetism associated with the superconducting state [Figs. 5(a) and 5(b)]; we attribute this variation to the likely change of the de-magnetization factor, which happens as a result of the sample position changes when pressure is changed. Another kink-like anomaly is observed at $T \sim 16$ K. We associated this anomaly with the magnetic transition T_M . Pressure values at low temperature were inferred from the superconducting transition of Sn, which also shown up in the data set at $T \sim 3.7$ K, i.e., way below T_c and T_M of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ (as indicated inside the pink circle in the figure). Figure 5(b) shows the blowup of the superconducting transition region of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$, demonstrating that T_c is suppressed as pressure is increased. To determine the magnetic transition temperature T_M , temperature derivative of the magnetization, dM/dT , was calculated and is presented in Fig. 5(c). The temperature corresponding to the minimum in dM/dT was taken as T_M , as indicated in the figure. It is clearly seen that T_M is increased upon increasing pressure.

We summarize the T_c and T_M values inferred from both resistance and magnetization measurements in the pressure-temperature (p - T) phase diagram shown in Fig. 6(a). To be consistent, T_c^{offset} determined from resistance measurements [Fig. 1(c)] and T_c^{onset} determined from magnetization measurements [Fig. 5(b)] were used and they match with each very well. As shown in Fig. 6(a), T_c of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ is monotonically suppressed upon increasing pressure up to 6.21 GPa. Starting with $T_c = 36.6$ K at ambient pressure, T_c




FIG. 5. (a) Evolution of the zero-field-cooled (ZFC) magnetization $M(T)$ with hydrostatic pressures up to 1.24 GPa under 20 mT applied field. Superconducting transition of Sn is used to determine the low temperature pressure, as indicated by the pink circle. (b) Blowup of the superconducting transition region for $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$. The criterion for T_c^{onset} is indicated by an arrow. (c) Temperature derivative of the magnetization, dM/dT , showing the evolution of the magnetic transition T_M . The criterion is indicated by an arrow. The small feature just above 15 K is an artifact caused by the combination of small temperature steps and details of the temperature control in MPMS-3.

is suppressed to 23.5 K at 6.21 GPa. In terms of magnetic transition T_M , it is linearly increased from 16.2 K at ambient pressure to 18.2 K at 1.24 GPa, with the rate of $dT_M/dp = 1.64$ K/GPa. To better understand the superconducting properties of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$, we further analyze the superconducting upper critical field [29,41,42,44]. Generally speaking, the slope of the upper critical field normalized by T_c is related to the Fermi velocity and superconducting gap of the system [43]. In the clean limit, for a single band,

$$-(1/T_c)(d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c} \propto 1/v_F^2, \quad (1)$$

where v_F is the Fermi velocity. Even though the superconductivity in $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ compounds is likely to be multiband, Eq. (1) can give qualitative insight into changes induced by pressure. As shown in Fig. 6(b), the normalized slope of the upper critical field $-(1/T_c)(d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c}$ (the slope $d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT$ is obtained by linearly fitting the data above 2 T in Fig. 4) is gradually suppressed by a factor of ~ 2.5 upon increasing pressure up to 6.21 GPa. No features in the normalized slope that could be associated with band structure change or Lifshitz transition, like the cases in many other Fe-based superconductors [29,41,42,44], are observed over the studied pressure range. Furthermore, the $R(p)$ curve at 40 K [Fig. 2(b)], a temperature that is close to T_c but still above




FIG. 6. (a) Pressure-temperature phase diagram of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$, as determined from resistance and magnetization measurements. Red and black symbols represent the superconducting T_c^{offset} and magnetic T_M phase transitions. (b) Pressure dependence of the normalized upper critical field slope $-(1/T_c)(d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c}$. The squares and triangles are data obtained from resistance measurement for sample 1 and sample 2, respectively. The diamonds are data obtained from magnetization measurement. Dashed lines are guides to the eye.

T_c and T_M , implies that resistivity is suppressed by a factor of ~ 2.7 as well. In a simple argument [45],

$$\rho \propto 1/(g_{\epsilon_F} \tau v_F^2), \quad (2)$$

where g_{ϵ_F} is density of states at the Fermi level and τ is the scattering time of these Fermi electrons. Equations (1) and (2), combined together, suggest that the decrease of both resistivity and $-(1/T_c)(d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c}$ with pressure can be explained by pressure induced increase of the Fermi velocity.

Data from this study, on single crystalline samples, and from the study on polycrystalline samples in Ref. [27] are plotted together and presented in the combined p - T phase diagram in Fig. 7. As shown in the figure, T_c from this study (determined by the offset of the transition via resistance measurement or onset of diamagnetism) matches very well with the T_c determined by the onset of diamagnetism in Ref. [27]. T_M data also match with each other over the studied pressure range.

The extrapolation of our $T_M(p)$ line in Fig. 6(a) as well as the data in Fig. 7 suggest that $T_c(p)$ and $T_M(p)$ should cross near 6 GPa. On one hand, the suppression of T_c with pressure gets stronger when pressure is increased, which might be related to the fact that $T_c(p)$ and $T_M(p)$ are getting closer at higher pressures. On the other hand, neither our pressure dependent T_c nor $-(1/T_c)(d\mu_0 H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c}$ data show any clear signature potentially associated with $T_c(p)$ and $T_M(p)$ crossing. Either they cross at a pressure higher than 6.21 GPa or their crossing does not have qualitative effect on $T_c(p)$ or $H_{c2}(T, p)$.




FIG. 7. Pressure-temperature phase diagram of $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ up to ~ 30 GPa, including data from Ref. [27] (open symbols). Open circles corresponds to the onset of the superconducting transition measured via resistivity or magnetic susceptibility. Open triangles corresponds to the magnetic transition determined from magnetic susceptibility or feature in $d\rho/dT$.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the resistance and magnetization of single crystalline $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$ has been studied under pressure.

In-plane resistance measurements under pressure up to 6.21 GPa reveal that superconducting transition T_c is monotonically suppressed. Magnetization measurements under pressure up to 1.24 GPa reveal that magnetic transition T_M is linearly increased. No indications of half-collapsed-tetragonal phase transition are observed up to 6.21 GPa. Further upper critical field analysis shows that the normalized slope, $-(1/T_c)(d\mu_o H_{c2}/dT)|_{T_c}$, is continuously suppressed upon increasing pressure up to 6.21 GPa, which is likely due to the continuous change of the Fermi velocity with pressure. Our results suggest that the magnetism of the Eu sublattice does not have significant influence on the superconducting behavior of FeAs layer in $\text{EuRbFe}_4\text{As}_4$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank U. Welp and V. G. Kogan for some preliminary results and useful discussions. This work is supported by the U.S. DOE, Basic Energy Sciences, Materials Science and Engineering Division under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358. L.X. was supported, in part, by the W. M. Keck Foundation. The synthesis and crystal growth were performed at Argonne National Laboratory which is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

- [1] A. Iyo, K. Kawashima, T. Kinjo, T. Nishio, S. Ishida, H. Fujihisa, Y. Gotoh, K. Kihou, H. Eisaki, and Y. Yoshida, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **138**, 3410 (2016).
- [2] K. Kawashima, T. Kinjo, T. Nishio, S. Ishida, H. Fujihisa, Y. Gotoh, K. Kihou, H. Eisaki, Y. Yoshida, and A. Iyo, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **85**, 064710 (2016).
- [3] W. R. Meier, Q.-P. Ding, A. Kreyssig, S. L. Bud'ko, A. Sapkota, K. Kothapalli, V. Borisov, R. Valentí, C. D. Batista, P. P. Orth, R. M. Fernandes, A. I. Goldman, Y. Furukawa, A. E. Böhrer, and P. C. Canfield, *npj Quantum Mater.* **3**, 5 (2018).
- [4] Y. Liu, Y.-B. Liu, Z.-T. Tang, H. Jiang, Z.-C. Wang, A. Ablimit, W.-H. Jiao, Q. Tao, C.-M. Feng, Z.-A. Xu, and G.-H. Cao, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 214503 (2016).
- [5] J.-K. Bao, K. Willa, M. P. Smylie, H. Chen, U. Welp, D. Y. Chung, and M. G. Kanatzidis, *Cryst. Growth Des.* **18**, 3517 (2018).
- [6] M. P. Smylie, K. Willa, J.-K. Bao, K. Ryan, Z. Islam, H. Claus, Y. Simsek, Z. Diao, A. Rydh, A. E. Koshelev, W.-K. Kwok, D. Y. Chung, M. G. Kanatzidis, and U. Welp, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 104503 (2018).
- [7] V. S. Stolyarov, A. Casano, M. A. Belyanchikov, A. S. Astrakhantseva, S. Y. Grebenchuk, D. S. Baranov, I. A. Golovchanskiy, I. Voloshenko, E. S. Zhukova, B. P. Gorshunov, A. V. Muratov, V. V. Dremov, L. Y. Vinnikov, D. Roditchev, Y. Liu, G. H. Cao, M. Dressel, and E. Uykur, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 140506(R) (2018).
- [8] M. A. Albedah, F. Nejdassattari, Z. M. Stadnik, Y. Liu, and G.-H. Cao, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 144426 (2018).
- [9] Z. A. Ren, G. C. Che, X. L. Dong, J. Yang, W. Lu, W. Yi, X. L. Shen, Z. C. Li, L. L. Sun, F. Zhou, and Z. X. Zhao, *Europhys. Lett.* **83**, 17002 (2008).
- [10] H. S. Jeevan, Z. Hossain, D. Kasinathan, H. Rosner, C. Geibel, and P. Gegenwart, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 052502 (2008).
- [11] S. Jiang, Y. Luo, Z. Ren, Z. Zhu, C. Wang, X. Xu, Q. Tao, G. Cao, and Z. Xu, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 025007 (2009).
- [12] W. A. Fertig, D. C. Johnston, L. E. DeLong, R. W. McCallum, M. B. Maple, and B. T. Matthias, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 987 (1977).
- [13] M. Ishikawa and Ø. Fischer, *Solid State Commun.* **23**, 37 (1977).
- [14] P. C. Canfield, S. L. Bud'ko, and B. K. Cho, *Physica C* **262**, 249 (1996).
- [15] S. S. Saxena, P. Agarwal, K. Ahilan, F. M. Grosche, R. K. W. Haselwimmer, M. J. Steiner, E. Pugh, I. R. Walker, S. R. Julian, P. Monthoux, G. G. Lonzarich, A. Huxley, I. Sheikin, D. Braithwaite, and J. Flouquet, *Nature (London)* **406**, 587 (2000).
- [16] D. Aoki, A. Huxley, E. Ressouche, D. Braithwaite, J. Flouquet, J.-P. Brison, E. Lhotel, and C. Paulsen, *Nature (London)* **413**, 613 (2001).
- [17] C. Pfleiderer, M. Uhlarz, S. M. Hayden, R. Vollmer, H. v. Löhneysen, N. R. Bernhoeft, and G. G. Lonzarich, *Nature (London)* **412**, 58 (2001).
- [18] N. T. Huy, A. Gasparini, D. E. de Nijs, Y. Huang, J. C. P. Klaasse, T. Gortenmulder, A. de Visser, A. Hamann, T. Görlach, and H. v. Löhneysen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 067006 (2007).
- [19] S. Jiang, H. Xing, G. Xuan, Z. Ren, C. Wang, Z.-a. Xu, and G. Cao, *Phys. Rev. B* **80**, 184514 (2009).
- [20] I. Nowik, I. Felner, Z. Ren, G. H. Cao, and Z. A. Xu, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **23**, 065701 (2011).
- [21] W.-H. Jiao, Q. Tao, J.-K. Bao, Y.-L. Sun, C.-M. Feng, Z.-A. Xu, I. Nowik, I. Felner, and G.-H. Cao, *Europhys. Lett.* **95**, 67007 (2011).

- [22] W.-H. Jiao, H.-F. Zhai, J.-K. Bao, Y.-K. Luo, Q. Tao, C.-M. Feng, Z.-A. Xu, and G.-H. Cao, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 113002 (2013).
- [23] W. T. Jin, S. Nandi, Y. Xiao, Y. Su, O. Zaharko, Z. Guguchia, Z. Bukowski, S. Price, W. H. Jiao, G. H. Cao, and T. Brückel, *Phys. Rev. B* **88**, 214516 (2013).
- [24] W. T. Jin, W. Li, Y. Su, S. Nandi, Y. Xiao, W. H. Jiao, M. Meven, A. P. Sazonov, E. Feng, Y. Chen, C. S. Ting, G. H. Cao, and T. Brückel, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 064506 (2015).
- [25] Y. Liu, Y.-B. Liu, Y.-L. Yu, Q. Tao, C.-M. Feng, and G.-H. Cao, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 224510 (2017).
- [26] K. Kawashima, S. Ishida, K. Oka, H. Kito, N. Takeshita, H. Fujihisa, Y. Gotoh, K. Kihou, H. Eisaki, Y. Yoshida, and A. Iyo, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* **969**, 012027 (2018).
- [27] D. E. Jackson, D. VanGennep, W. Bi, D. Zhang, P. Materne, Y. Liu, G.-H. Cao, S. T. Weir, Y. K. Vohra, and J. J. Hamlin, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 014518 (2018).
- [28] U. S. Kaluarachchi, V. Taufour, A. Sapkota, V. Borisov, T. Kong, W. R. Meier, K. Kothapalli, B. G. Ueland, A. Kreyssig, R. Valenti, R. J. McQueeney, A. I. Goldman, S. L. Budko, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 140501(R) (2017).
- [29] L. Xiang, W. R. Meier, M. Xu, U. S. Kaluarachchi, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 174517 (2018).
- [30] V. Borisov, P. C. Canfield, and R. Valentí, *Phys. Rev. B* **98**, 064104 (2018).
- [31] E. Colombier and D. Braithwaite, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **78**, 093903 (2007).
- [32] B. Bireckoven and J. Wittig, *J. Phys. E* **21**, 841 (1988).
- [33] M. S. Torikachvili, S. K. Kim, E. Colombier, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **86**, 123904 (2015).
- [34] https://www.qdusa.com/sitedocs/productBrochures/High_Pressure_Cell_for_Magnetometry_Brochure.pdf
- [35] K. Yokogawa, K. Murata, H. Yoshino, and S. Aoyama, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* **46**, 3636 (2007).
- [36] A. Eiling and J. S. Schilling, *J. Phys. F* **11**, 623 (1981).
- [37] S. Ran, S. L. Bud'ko, W. E. Straszheim, J. Soh, M. G. Kim, A. Kreyssig, A. I. Goldman, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **85**, 224528 (2012).
- [38] E. Gati, S. Köhler, D. Guterding, B. Wolf, S. Knöner, S. Ran, S. L. Bud'ko, P. C. Canfield, and M. Lang, *Phys. Rev. B* **86**, 220511(R) (2012).
- [39] E. Colombier, S. L. Bud'ko, N. Ni, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 224518 (2009).
- [40] E. Colombier, M. S. Torikachvili, N. Ni, A. Thaler, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, *Supercond. Sci. Technol.* **23**, 054003 (2010).
- [41] U. S. Kaluarachchi, V. Taufour, A. E. Böhmer, M. A. Tanatar, S. L. Bud'ko, V. G. Kogan, R. Prozorov, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **93**, 064503 (2016).
- [42] L. Xiang, U. S. Kaluarachchi, A. E. Böhmer, V. Taufour, M. A. Tanatar, R. Prozorov, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 024511 (2017).
- [43] V. G. Kogan and R. Prozorov, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 114502 (2012).
- [44] V. Taufour, N. Foroozani, M. A. Tanatar, J. Lim, U. Kaluarachchi, S. K. Kim, Y. Liu, T. A. Lograsso, V. G. Kogan, R. Prozorov, S. L. Budko, J. S. Schilling, and P. C. Canfield, *Phys. Rev. B* **89**, 220509(R) (2014).
- [45] S. Kasap, *Principles of Electronic Materials and Devices*, 3rd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 2006).